

MORI BUNDLE # \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

PAGES \_\_\_\_\_

Box \_\_\_\_\_

Folder # \_\_\_\_\_

Fon # \_\_\_\_\_

***BEST COPY***

***AVAILABLE***

JUN 11 1958

94 Sanitized - APPROVED FOR RELEASE CIA-REF ID: A0001R0603003600305339

We give high school scholarships to those who can qualify. We give post-graduate scholarships in the United States on a competitive basis to Peruvian employees who are graduate engineers. On our supervisory staff we employ more Peruvian engineers than all other nationalities put together, and would rather employ a Peruvian than an American or Canadian if the qualifications and experience were in any way comparable, which they more and more often are. We pay them salaries commensurate with their positions. We have a training department for the workers, to help them to advance in their jobs, to become more productive and therefore earn more money. Workers are housed in campamentos with covered cement floors, kitchens and plumbing.

Regarding the lead-zinc industry, there are low-cost and efficient producers in this country, and they will, of course, stay in business. It is the high-cost producers from marginal mines with very low-grade ores who must face the economic facts of life.

I hope you will take the time to read the enclosed statements I have, on various occasions, made recently. I am very sympathetic with anyone in any line of business who cannot make a living at it, but in the long run Government subsidies and tariffs are not the answer, nor should they be in our society.

Sincerely yours,  
ROBERT P. KOENIG, President.

### Great Work

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. EMMET F. BYRNE**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my attention was directed recently to a word of praise to the Chicago policeman and fireman, appearing in the Southtown Economist of May 28.

For many years I have been a defense and trial lawyer and have spent many hours with various Chicago policemen. My admiration and respect, as well as my affection for them, is a deep thing. A good policeman and a fireman is someone who merits the respect and cooperation of every citizen desiring law and order; protection from those who would harm us or protection and rescue from fire which could destroy not only our property but our life.

I believe that Chicago can certainly be proud of our police and fire departments.

Two Chicago detectives who reside in my district have performed meritoriously recently. Had it not been for their quick actions, a child might have been murdered. I wish to commend Steve Hanna, 8742 South Loomis and Joseph Nolan, 7405 South Claremont, both of Chicago, as well as the other policemen who assisted in apprehending the criminal.

When our public servants do something praiseworthy, they should be given a thank you. They have a difficult type of work to perform.

The commendation follows:

### GREAT WORK

The late Mayor Thompson used to say that the reason everybody liked firemen is that firemen save lives, and that the reason so few like policemen is that police put people behind bars.

But two Southtown residents who are policemen deserve public applause for putting behind bars a dangerous criminal who today would be held for murder instead of kidnaping had not the two policemen acted quickly.

We refer to Detectives Steve Hanna, 8742 South Loomis Boulevard, and Joseph Nolan, 7405 South Claremont Avenue. When they learned that a 7-year-old child had been seized from a schoolyard, they rushed in their car to the scene of the kidnaping and traced the route taken by the criminal. They had him in custody within 32 minutes after he had taken the terrorized child.

Commendation also is deserving of all the other police, including those from Blue Island, who joined in the mass manhunt. The performance of all was exemplary.

### Conservatives Debate on Oppenheimer at Harvard

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OR

**HON. WINT SMITH**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1958

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, much has been written about the so-called Dr. Oppenheimer case. It is common knowledge that Dr. Oppenheimer delivered some lectures at Harvard. Many people were somewhat mystified that Harvard should invite him to deliver these lectures.

The following articles illustrate very clearly the difficulties that surround any group when they try to counteract the actions of the so-called liberal crowd.

It is strange indeed that the great and illustrious institution of Harvard that has so proudly proclaimed truth, liberty, and freedom and, above all else, academic freedom, should invite Dr. Oppenheimer over the protests of the students.

It is somewhat difficult to make these ancient heritages of Harvard stand up in view of the difficulties presented to some conservatives when they wanted to know the whyfors of Dr. Oppenheimer's invitation.

I commend these articles by William Brady:

CONSERVATIVES DEBATE ON OPPENHEIMER AT HARVARD

(By William Cuthbert Brady, founder of the Harvard Conservative Club)

Harvard's time-honored watchword, "Veritas," was compromised with the appointment of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer as William James lecturer—over the protests of alumni and students. The issue is: Should Harvard lend its name and prestige to a confessed liar and security risk as a philosopher? Alumni opposition to the appointment was spearheaded by Col. Archibald R. Roosevelt and Mr. Kenneth D. Robertson, Jr., members of the Harvard Veritas Committee. The rallying point for student protest became

the Harvard Athenaeum, an undergraduate conservative debate organization.<sup>1</sup>

This organization prepared a 10-page memorandum on the Oppenheimer case and sent copies, together with letters requesting information on why and how Oppenheimer was selected for the lectures, to Judge Charles E. Wyman, Jr., chairman of the board of overseers, and Dr. Nathan M. Pusey, president of the university and the corporation. Judge Wyman replied that the corpus delecti is not in the board of overseers. Mr. Pusey replied that he hardly thought it necessary to comment on Oppenheimer's qualifications for the lectureship, since they speak for themselves.

To encourage a more balanced perspective on Oppenheimer in the University, the Athenaeum decided to sponsor a debate on the topic: Should Oppenheimer Be James Philosophy Lecturer at Harvard? The debate idea met with the solid opposition of liberal professors at Harvard and Massachusetts Institute of Technology (in all, 14 were asked to defend Oppenheimer; all declined), with the result that the Athenaeum was obliged to seek affirmative speakers elsewhere, eventually obtaining them through the American Civil Liberties Union. The group would not be dissuaded from holding the debate simply because the liberals had decreed against it.

The debate was finally held on Tuesday, April 16, at Phillips Brooks House. Defending the Oppenheimer appointment were Attorney Howard S. Whiteside, counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union, and Dr. Chase Kimball, also connected with the ACLU and former professor of law at Boston University. Opposing them were two gentlemen who readily agreed to participate in the debate: Dr. Medford Evans, professor of social science at Northwestern State College of Louisiana and for 8 years Chief of Training in the Atomic Energy Commission, and Dr. Willmoore Kendall, professor of political science at Yale University and an editor of National Review.

Dr. Kimball, first speaker for the affirmative, called the debate discourteous to Oppenheimer. He spoke in general about free speech and academic freedom, and said that these principles required that Oppenheimer be allowed to speak at Harvard.

Dr. Evans, the next speaker, emphasized that Oppenheimer, by his own admission, had told "a whole fabrication and tissue of lies" in great circumstantial detail to security officers in wartime, and that "Oppie" had been less than candid on other occasions. He presented evidence that, instead of lying to protect his friends, Oppenheimer had actually sold them out.

ACLU Attorney Whiteside's rebuttal consisted largely of a rehearsal of Oppenheimer's achievements as a scientist, together with the observation that he was more than a scientist. Recalling Oppenheimer's brilliant success in directing production of the first atomic bombs, Whiteside stated: "No evidence has ever been produced that information was lost to the United States by anything he did."

Professor Kendall, final speaker for the negative, characterized the appointment as an instrument for rehabilitating Oppenheimer's reputation and for discrediting the Government's security program. The main reason for opposing Oppenheimer's appointment as James Lecturer, Kendall stated, was

<sup>1</sup> The dissenters did not object to Oppenheimer's coming *per se*; as the guest of an undergraduate extracurricular group, he would have excited little protest, if any. Under the official sponsorship of the university, however, his arrival involved everyone at Harvard.